

This meeting was held in conjunction with the Scoping Period for the East Fork Boulder Creek Native Fish Restoration EA. Community members assisted forest personnel in developing the agenda. There was no process used to reach consensus on any of these topics, nor was reaching consensus an objective of the meeting. These notes reflect what was recorded on flipcharts at the meeting. Participants were encouraged to submit written comments for the record. The Forest Service will review these meeting notes to see if there were any unique comments or ideas raised during the community meeting that were not raised by written comments.

AGENDA

- Start at 7:00 pm
- Welcome – Terry DeLay
- Introductions, Agenda, Groundrules
- Connecting the Dots
- Small Groups on three questions (see below)
- Short Open House
- Report Out
- Group Synthesis
- Open House
- Ends 9:00 pm

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Connect the Dots
- Provide information on EA process
- Group Discussion on issues, questions, and alternatives
- Opportunity for written comments

This meeting is not.....

- -Another education session
- -A formal public hearing
- A venue for argument
- A venue for the agency to convince you

GROUND RULES

- Raise hands

- No side conversations
- Respect each other
- No one dominates

What Alternatives or Options Do You Think that the Forest Service Should Consider?

[Note: Color and strikeout were as recorded on the flipchart]

1. No Action
2. Proposed Action
3. Non Chemical – intensive fishing – catch and keep a bunch – fish harvest
4. Fish Barriers – keep CRCT up high
Introduction of Beaver – What effect will this have on proposed project?
5. What do they do in States where rotenone is not allowed.
6. Does it have to be a total kill.
7. Maintain Symbiotic Relationship with all natives fishes and invertebrates – benchmark study – Good study area
8. ~~Leave it alone~~
9. ~~Good Study Area~~
10. Kill Cutthroat – plant more Brooks
11. Go to an EIS
12. Physiological / Spiritual Aspect
13. Why do we keep undoing past mistakes
14. Declare it Wilderness
15. Long Term Residual Effects
16. Use of Antimycin instead of Rotenone
17. Way to eliminate mercury build-up in fish.

What Questions Do You Still Have About the Proposed Action?

1. Why get rid of Brook trout? and Rainbow?
2. What kind of monitoring (will there be) of effects on other species than native fish? (short- and long-range).
3. Have you checked for other species that might be endangered? (not just fish, frogs, bugs, livestock, etc.)
4. Why does this project have to be done, and why is the USFS doing it instead of DWR?
5. What will be the impact on our irrigation water?
6. If it was such a disaster in Deer Creek, why are they doing it again here?
7. Has anyone in the project group ever fished in this area?
8. Are there considerations other than science (irrigation water, moral, ethics, etc.) that will be seriously weighed?
9. Is this just the beginning of a bigger project? (will it move then to lakes, etc?)
10. Are we going to be getting additional treatments on a periodic basis?
11. Who will benefit from this project? Who will lose?
12. Are there any other endangered or protected species that would be affected?
13. Is this decision constrained by previously determined agency precedent and legal documents?

14. Could the citizens vote?
15. Is the project practical?
16. How does eradication of all species benefit others than the one that is being saved?
17. Does this expand the role of government?
18. What role does Trout Unlimited play in this?
19. Is the only acceptable outcome 100% CRCT, or would a percentage of others possible?
20. Wasn't this tried 10 years ago, and did it fail?
21. If the CRCT isn't endangered and appears to be on the rebound, why go to such draconian measures for one drainage?
22. What about putting the emphasis on protecting existing CRCT populations rather than eradicating all existing mixed species?
23. Give the number of uncertainties; why not go right to an EIS?
24. If it's decided that the rotenone project doesn't have to be done, what will be the effect on the FERC project?
25. What would the ramifications be of going with a "No Action" decision?
26. What damage do the fish do that's causing this action, and what damage do we do? Which damage is bigger?
27. What guarantees are there that the CRCT won't be affected by excessive mercury concentrations?
28. Environmental justice for impoverished communities – do you have to consider the economical impact on organic farming and businesses marketing based on our environmental purity?

What issues/Concerns Do You Have With the Proposed Action?

1. Adverse affects on habitat (F & F).
2. Effects in the food chain.
3. Success rate of the CRCT.
4. Fundamental re-evaluation of rotenone and medical science, health, and safety.
5. Economic cost of project.
6. Water testing in Boulder irrigation.
7. Human error in application.
8. Synergistic effects of R, PP, PC.
9. Ecology of soul.
10. Springs upstream that drink!
11. Economic impacts in town.
12. Rare and endemic species in springs.
13. Native fish restoration (Alternatives).
14. Future of Garkane expanding green energy.
15. 2 CFS – diverted from power generation and irrigation – not enough for fish re-introduction.
16. Effects on recreation (Short Lake) ruining good fishing.
17. Reputation of Aquarius Plateau/Boulder Mountain.
18. Unintended consequences.
19. Effects on aquifer.
20. Science can't quantify the mystery of water.

21. Moral and ethical considerations eradicate all for one, drastic effects on all life.
22. Treatment of private property.
23. Restocking of CRCT not addressed (inconsistent).
24. Sterile hybrids and angling regulations.
25. "C" – water – loss of pasture.